

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

MAY 24 2005

Confirmation No. 4279

Appl. No. : 10/716,048  
Applicant : Victor Chartrand  
Filed : 11-17-2003  
TG/A.U. : 2642  
Examiner : Quynh H. Nguyen  
Docket No. : 03-1124-CHART  
Customer No. : 26357

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

NUMBER OF PAGES: 3 (Includes this page)

---

**Certificate of Transmission**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the  
United States Receiving Office, Fax. No. 703-872-9306 on May 24, 2005.

Typed name of person signing this certificate: Robert M. Hunter

Signature: Robert M. Hunter

42,679

Tel: 808-885-4194

PTOL-413A (09-04)  
 Approved for use through 07/31/2008. OMB 0851-0031  
 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/716,048 First Named Applicant: Victor Chartrand  
 Examiner: Quynh H. Nguyen Art Unit: 242 Status of Application: pending

#### Tentative Participants:

(1) Robert M. Hunter (2) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) \_\_\_\_\_ (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Date of Interview: June 2, 2005 Proposed Time: 3 pm ET (AM/PM)

#### Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

### Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) Rej	Cl:1	Catron+Brankley	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) Rej	Cl:1,10,15,24	Catron+Brankley	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) Rej	Cl:10,15,24	Catron+Brankley	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) Rej	Cl:35,42,49,50,58	Catron+Brankley	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Continuation Sheet Attached					

#### Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

see attached sheet

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Robert M. Hunter  
 Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner/SPE Signature

Robert M. Hunter

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

42,679

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Continuation of Brief Description of the Arguments to be Presented:

With respect to claim 1, where is the following limitation taught by the references: "but not always" (see line 3)? Where does the Catron reference and/or the Brankley et al. reference teach a method wherein a combination (e.g., a dialed prefix plus seven digits) can be used to identify any one type of communications device, i.e., that a combination can be used to identify a fax machine, a second land line, OR a cellular telephone, etc. at the whim of each individual customer?

With respect to claims 1, 10, 15 and 24, where is the following limitation taught by the references: "right to . . . use . . . any one" (see lines 8-10)? Where does the Catron reference and/or the Brankley et al. reference teach a system or method wherein a certain prefix may be used by the customer to identify ANY one specific type of communications device? How can the customer in the Catron reference opt out of use of a voice messaging system "identifier" to identify a voice messaging system, for example, and decide to use the identifier that other customers use to identify a call to a voice messaging system to identify her fax machine?

With respect to claims 10, 15 and 24, where is the following limitation taught by the references: "exclusive right to optionally use . . . a combination" (see lines 8-10)? Where does the Catron reference and/or the Brankley et al. reference teach a system or method wherein each customer has the exclusive right to optionally use such a combination, whether or not the 7-digit number that has been assigned to her is being used as a voice landline. The specification makes it clear and claim 43 points out that "at least one communications device must be in service for each particular customer" (lines 1-3) to maintain that exclusive right, but that one device need not be a voice landline.

With respect to claims 35, 42, 49, 50 and 58 where is the following limitation taught by the references: "said specific communications device of the particular subscriber being reachable by the caller's dialing no other common 7-digit telephone number" (see lines 6-12)? Where does the Catron reference and/or the Brankley et al. reference teach a system or method wherein each customer's voice messaging system, electronic mail system, fax machine, etc. does NOT have a separate 7-digit telephone number by which it can also be reached? Only by eliminating the need for every communications device to have a separate 7-digit telephone number can the applicant's invention produce the necessary results recited by the thereby clauses of claims 1, 49, 50 and 58. None of the references multiplies the available number of assignable telephone numbers by providing the structure and steps claimed by the applicant.

The applicant agrees that "the Brankley et al. reference requires a prefix code that is assigned to each type of message carried by the system" in order for that system to achieve its intended purpose. Combining the Brankley et al. reference with the Catron reference is therefore inappropriate because "if proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (MPEP 2143.01).